REMARKS

In response to the Official Action mailed May 27, 2004, Applicants amend their application and request reconsideration. In this Amendment, no claims are added or canceled so that claims 40-59 remain pending. No new matter has been added.

The Official Action rejects all of the claims 40-59 based on prior art of record. Specifically, independent claims 40 and 50 and dependent claims 45-48 and 55-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,361,361 to Hickman et al. (hereinafter "Hickman"). The remaining dependent claims are rejected as obvious (35 U.S.C. § 103 a) over Hickman when considered with other prior art of record. Specifically, claims 44, 49, 54 and 59 are rejected as being unpatentable over Hickman in view of U.S. Patent 6,236,989 to Mandyam et al. (hereinafter "Mandyam") and claims 41-43 and 51-53 are rejected as being unpatentable over Hickman in view of U.S. Patent 5,825,356 to Habib et al. (hereinafter "Habib").

Claims 40 and 50 are amended to clarify that the taxonomy structure is unified, in that a first level of categories in the unified taxonomy structure is predefined. Accordingly, the invention maintains coherency of the taxonomy by providing a degree of resemblance the taxonomy structures of different systems (see p. 15, lines 10-20, of the patent application).

To facilitate an understanding of the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art relied upon in the Official Action, the following is a brief summary of the invention.

According to the invention, a unified help framework integrates the help contents provided by different vendors of software and hardware components of a computer, allowing a user to easily find useful help topics. The help topics from the different vendors are integrated into a unified taxonomy structure having different levels of help categories and help topics organized into a hierarchical structure. To provide such integration and structure, data from a database in a help framework maps the help topics into the unified taxonomy structure, thereby providing help topics from different vendors to coexist in one common taxonomy structure. Moreover, the first level of help categories and topics in the unified taxonomy structure are predefined under the invention. Thus, vendors' topics are fit into to the unified taxonomy structure, and the user is provided a more consistent experience. *See e.g.,* Specification p. 13, lines 18-25; p. 15, lines 10-20; p. 16, lines 6-10. With the help topics from different vendors integrated into one unified taxonomy structure, the user can easily navigate through the various help categories and locate the help topics she is looking for.

Providing mapping data for mapping help topics from different vendors into a unified taxonomy structure wherein the first level of categories is predefined is neither taught nor suggested by the references or record. In contrast to the claims as amended herein, Hickman describes the help utility dynamically creates the taxonomy structure of the help viewer. In Hickman, the help utility determines which applications are registered in the operating system. It then generates a bookcase displaying as-is the various help topics and subtopics that it found Hickman does not disclose that the various topics and subtopics are fit into a predefined taxonomy structure. *See* col. 7, lines 30-67; Fig. 5; and Fig. 6 of Hickman. For example, consider a computer where only application 1 and application 2 are installed. Under the help utility of Hickman, the only topics present in the taxonomy structure of help topics are those topics that are present in application 1 and application 2. If application 2 is uninstalled and replaced with application 3, the taxonomy structure at the first level also changes. Thus, Hickman does not teach that a first level of categories in the unified taxonomy structure being predefined as recited in amended claims 40 and 50. Accordingly, Hickman cannot anticipate those claims, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Regarding claims 42, 43, 52, and 53, the Official Action merely states that:

> "[S]ince particular sets of scripts are associated with specific help contents... it is interpreted that with the above-described combination of Hickman and Habib, there exists some sort of store which is checked to identify which scripts to execute for particular help content. In other words, it is understood that there exists an "authorization store," like that described in claims 42, 43, 52, and 53.

Applicants respectfully submit that it is not understood at all. Applicants do not understand how the assertion that "there exists some sort of store which is checked to identify which scripts to execute for particular help content" necessarily leads to the conclusion that Hickman and Habib teach or suggest *an authorization store for storing information identifying which of the help contents are authorized to access the script library objects.* Moreover, the Official Action fails to point out how this assertion further teaches *a help application that is further programmed to check the authorization store to determine whether the help content of the user-selected help topic is allowed to access the script library objects.*

The Official Action's implication that these teachings are somehow inherent is not supported by the combination of Hickman and Habib. Even if Habib maintains some kind of mapping between help content and scripts, such a mapping does not necessarily prevent help topics

from accessing script objects other than their own. Thus, such a mapping does constitute an authorization store that mediates access between help content and script objects. Clearly, the limitations of claims 42, 43, 52, and 53 are not taught or suggested by Hickman and Habib.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections, as well as prompt allowance of the pending claims, are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

A. Wesley Ferrebee, Reg. No. 51,312
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER
700 Thirteenth Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, DC 20005-3960
(202) 737-6770 (telephone)
(202) 737-6776 (facsimile)

Date: 8/10/04

Amendment or ROA - Regular (Revised 6/5/04)